

Charlie Geier, Megan Purcell, Jeanne Zehr, Beth Barrett, Beth Stroh, Kevin Bain, Danny Kelley, Jill Raisor, Theresa Heiney, Cathne Holliday, Amanda Lopez

Heather Girton has resigned.

Minutes and Agenda posted 3 business days after meeting.

What took COR off table: Cost and mass amount of training that went with it

Charlie: First concern. Is the assessment only being used for the students using the PreK dollars? Yes. 2<sup>nd</sup> concern: The disruption in the classroom/ integrity of the assessment is compromised

We want the PreK pilot to flow smoothly and not be a disruption/distraction from the classroom

Element of RFP is actually asking bidder about this (above: minimizing distractions) and how to ensure the validity of the test results. These issues will be part of the discussions with the winning bidder.

The 3 options came together at the very end of the last meeting, which is what led us to what we are evaluating.

Peabody has an expressive EBT, but it requires a trained person to conduct it, whereas with PPBT, anyone can conduct it (not just a speech-language pathologist)

Charlie and Dana Jones have been representing Indiana in a Consortium of 7 States. (IN is an advisory state, joined the Consortia to learn) OHIO, MD, MI, NV rolling out a KEA (OH, MD full implementation this fall!) It has a formative, ongoing assessment, not connected to curriculum. Several states leaving Common COR/ other benefit is that it can be customized to collect data specific to what you want to know. West Ed is entity hired to develop the tool (MD is fiscal agent) \$4/student. There are multiple of these Consortia throughout the country—talk of getting all the Consortia together.

Danny: To clarify, what is CT Conference called? Early Childhood EAG (Enhanced Assessment Grants)

Kevin says let's use what we have to make a decision for the Pilot, but we can still investigate other things, including the Consortia(s) when we recommend the statewide KEA (or KRA) tool. This is to feed into the longitudinal study to determine the value of high quality preschool. Other states with KEA/KRA recommendations have already crossed this bridge and may use different determining qualities to choose a statewide tool.

---

### **First Option: “the Cocktail”**

*\*Eva had not been able to talk to publisher about the social/emotional tool she proposed in previous meeting.*

Beth Stroh is not going to vote on a tool right now. She just joined workgroup.

Jill Raisor: Knows of a school district that negotiated a lower price on GOLD (\$12/child)/  
Pro= Parents can log onto GOLD from home! ISTAR is ok, but needs a lot of updating to get where it needs to be.

Megan to Charlie: Is there time to make ISTAR KR what we want it to be as a comprehensive piece for the PreK pilot? Charlie: It depends on what you want it to be. It will never be GOLD, but it can be adjusted and we own it. (It is based on the Learning Connection platform—which would be hard to change, a huge undertaking, overhaul of the platform.) The sleekness will probably never be there unless we invest more money and would take a year+, but right now, more domains can be added, it can be enhanced.

Control and treatment group can be done now using ISTAR, and we would have an apples to apples comparison if ISTAR-KR was chosen as the official pilot assessment.

We can use the social/emotional part of ISTAR as a stand-alone.

For a state to have its own assessment is an asset. Do we want to make an investment in an asset we already have?

Megan: If we choose one thing for the Pilot and then choose something else for statewide assessment, how is that going to “go over”?

We have to make a decision on the information we have available today.

Beth: we need to keep in mind the other studies going on in the state and maintain alignment for our audience (the public and legislators).

Amanda: We should look at what data will result from the each assessment option, and how will that look to legislators? Lets look through the lens of the audience who will be using the data.

1 off

2 off

1 off

2 off

2 off

2 off

1

1

1

Option one is off the table due to a group vote!

Jeanne Z says, PPVT + Bracken + ISTAR-KR social emotional tool

Option one back on table-ish.

So, the question is just choosing GOLD vs. ISTAR?

If we take GOLD off the table for the Pilot, it would not take it off the table for the statewide assessment

Danny: Question regarding ISTAR-KR: How would we get from where we are today to a version of ISTAR ready for the Pilot? And who would be in charge of figuring that out? Right now, it is considered a valid and reliable tool today in its current form. If we want to enhance it, this group or a subgroup or whomever would discuss changes in 2 categories: *what is absolutely essential* for the PreK pilot and *what would be nice to have* for the Prek pilot? Then we would ask the developers how much time it would take to be done and get a prototype. In house DOE are the “developers” and changing it would require a buy-out of someone’s time, but a RFP or contract would not be needed. In theory, it could happen in a week.

Kevin: A strength of the option on the table is that the Pilot may not require re-tooling ISTAR. Especially if we are just using just the social/emotional part for one year. It gives us time to weigh in the changes of ISTAR that would be necessary for a statewide assessment and discuss it further.

Kevin, we are taking the re-vamp of ISTAR-KR for the decision we are making today. We may want to talk about what ISTAR KR can be down the road, but for the Pilot, and for investment purposes and comparison purposes (to other studies currently being done) Jeanne believes it to be a no-brainer to use ISTAR for now. And, the cost thing is huge.

“Retool” vs. “enhancement” –2 different things. Enhancements can be made for the Prek Pilot, but not re-tooling at this point.

Did anyone contact GOLD to see what the Indiana cost could be? Can it be negotiated? Danny did, \$9.95 per student per year and free startup. Can be negotiated down further if used statewide.

Wait, are we voting on all of ISTAR or just the social/emotional part of it?  
Clarification: The Pilot would just collect PPVT, Bracken, and social/emotional part of ISTAR.

Teacher would be responsible for ISTAR soc/emo only, an evaluator would do the other 2. The evaluator will be retained using funds from the longitudinal study.

Teresa H: When she talked to the PPVT rep, it was said that anyone could collect the data and that was supposed to be the plus of PPVT, but now we are talking about an external evaluator doing the PPVT.

**Housekeeping items:**

May have open seats in workgroups due to non-participating members—TCG will follow up with people.

Action item: review member list and make a recommendation of who else should be at the table (if you don't know names, think of professions and organizations who should be represented)

High-level project plan will be discussed/presented at full ELAC meeting tomorrow.

EEMG year 1 program is kicking off this month and this group is responsible for managing the evaluation!

Next meeting is September 11<sup>th</sup>.

We may change our meeting location since Heather G has resigned from UW. Watch for changes on Wiggiio.

MSD Lawrence township, old middle school that usually can house a meeting/ all wired for virtual meeting/ the location change will be notified on Wiggiio and in Meeting minutes.

**Working on Verbiage for Recommendation**

ISTAR's ability to be correlated with other studies

Walk ELAC through each step of the review process, from the 17 assessment tools on down. Talk about what organizations were represented in this decision and how different audiences were considered.

...and the same group continues to work on the statewide KRA which will be recommended in a few months.

Formal one-page

Template:

Workgroup name

Background info

Bullets

The recommendation is

Date

Rationale/Process/ Recommendation

- Kevin envisioning 2 documents: the long version of how we got to where we got on the decision (and could go into workgroup files on Wiggiio)
- Then Readers Digest version of that will be handed out tomorrow.

### **ELAC Recommendation Template**

Date:

Workgroup Name:

Background / Process:

Recommendation:

We are looking at the comparison across the other studies too, not just the cost.